

Interview Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/763,577		ROBISON ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Sisay Yacob		2612	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Sisay Yacob. (3) _____

(2) Randol W. Read. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 07 June 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: Claim 18.

Identification of prior art discussed: Pia et al. (5,890,540), Angle (6,431,270), Schwendemann et al. (4,636,934).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Advisory action was issued stating applicant's amendment to independent claim 18 raised new issues, however, the amendment was same limitations that were presented in now canceled dependent claims 22 and 25. Furthermore, the prior arts of record, Pia et al., Angle and Schwendemann et al. failing to Disclose, teache or suggest limitations: "displaying an image representing the rotation of the actuating member on the touch screen, wherein the image comprises an indicator bar."